Serial No. 09/702,963
Page 7 of 10

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 4-5, 11, 16, 19-21, 24, 27, 30-32, and 35-38 are amended herein.

Claims 2-3, 6, and 15 are herby cancelled.

Claims 7-10, 12-14, 17-18, 22-23, 25-26, 28-29, and 33-34 continue unamended.

No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,983,001 issued to Boughner et al. on November 9, 1999 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,501 issued to Garner et al. on April 28, 1998.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewriting to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of

362244-1

any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,983,001 to Boughner et al. (hereinafter, "Boughner") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,501 to Garner et al. (hereinafter, "Garner"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

While applicant agrees with the Examiner that Boughner does not explicitly specify "inputting a model of a computer component object behavior into a test generator," in the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the module model with test stimuli, as taught in Garner, with the test script generator of Boughner, for the purpose of creating test script commands. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As admitted by the Examiner, Boughner fails to teach or suggest applicant's invention as a whole. Furthermore, Garner fails to bridge the substantial gap between Boughner and applicant's invention.

Garner discloses a method and apparatus for generating integrated circuit test patterns for testing functionality of integrated circuits. In particular, Garner discloses validating integrated circuit test patterns, transforming the integrated circuit test patterns into test vectors, and applying the test vectors to external connections of an integrated circuit in order to test the functionality of the integrated circuit. (Garner, Abstract). Garner, however, also fails to teach or suggest at least a model of a computer component object behavior. In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that module models 208 disclosed in Garner are equivalent to applicant's model of a computer component object behavior. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As taught in Garner, integrated circuit test patterns 218 are produced, in part, from module test patterns 212, which are, in turn, produced from module drive patterns 206 and module expected patterns 210. The module expected patterns 210 are produced from module models 208, which are, in turn, produced from the module drive patterns 206. Furthermore, Garner discloses that the module drive patterns 206 comprise binary data, and discloses "...comparing the binary results obtained from the integrated circuit with the binary integrated circuit test

302244-1

Serial No. 09/702,963
Page 9 of 10

patterns..." (Garner, Col. 7, Lines 58-59). In other words, as disclosed in Garner, the module expected patterns and the integrated circuit test patterns are simply binary signals. A test script, on the other hand, includes computer executable commands capable of being processed by an automated test executor. As such, module models used for producing binary signal patterns, as taught in Garner, are simply not computer component object behavior models for producing a test script, as taught in applicant's invention of at least claim 1. Thus, Boughner and Garner, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest applicant's invention as a whole.

Furthermore, applicant submits that it is inappropriate to combine the teachings of Boughner and Garner. Boughner is directed towards recordation of manual user actions performed via a graphical user interface, and storage of event information associated with the manual user actions. Garner, on the other hand, is directed towards hardware testing, i.e., generation of integrated circuit test signals and comparison of the generated signals to expected resulting signals. Thus, since Bougner is directed towards graphical user interface interactions, while Garner is directed towards hardware testing, they cannot be combined.

Therefore, applicant submits that independent claim 1 is allowable over Boughner in view of Garner under 35 U.S.C. §103. Similar to independent claim 1, independent claims 11, 19, 27, and 35 include the limitation of "a model of a computer component object behavior". Thus, claims 11, 19, 27, and 35 are likewise allowable over Boughner in view of Garner under 35 U.S.C. §103. Since each of claims 4-5, 7-10, 12-14, 16-18, 20-26, 28-29, 31-34, and 37-38 depend from one of independent claims 1, 11, 19, 27 and 35, these dependent claims are also allowable over Boughner in view of Garner under 35 U.S.C. §103.

362244-1

Serial No. 09/702,963
Page 10 of 10

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all the rejections have been overcome and that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and its allowance are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/23/05

Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicant

MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808

362244-1